REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Abstract; objects to the specification due to an informality; rejects claims 1-65 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,010); objects to claim 1 due to an informality; rejects claims 1-3, 5, 10-16, 18, 31, 38-43, 45, 58, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,062); rejects claims 4, 17, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of NOAKE (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,222); rejects claims 6, 8, 9, 19-21, 23, 25, 46-48, 50, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of CHRISTIE et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,656); rejects claims 7, 22, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of FARRIS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,445); rejects claims 27-29 and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of KOBAYASHI et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,371); rejects claims 30 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of SMITH et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,823); rejects claims 32-37 and 59-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of KILKKI et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,039); and objects to claims 24, 26, and 51 as allowable if rewritten into independent form.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants amend the specification and Abstract to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-81 remain pending. Of these claims, claims 66-81 have been withdrawn due to a restriction requirement.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 24, 26, and 51 would be

allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Abstract due to an informality. Applicants provide a replacement Abstract herewith on a separate sheet of paper that addresses the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The specification stands objected due to an informality. Applicants amend the specification herein to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-65 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in light of claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,010). In support of the rejection, the Examiner asserts that, though claims 1-65 of the present application are not identical to claims 1-22 of GALLANT, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-65 of the present application merely broadens the scope of claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, "propagating said signaling message to a policy server, said policy server including at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features;" "determining in said policy server, based at least in part on said signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked;" "if so, determining whether a policy condition associated with said particular policy feature is satisfied with respect to said signaling message;" and "establishing a connection path between said ingress switch and said egress switch based on said determination that said policy condition is satisfied by said signaling message." Identical

features to these features of claim 1, or even similar features, are not recited in any of claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. Since claim 1 recites features not contained in claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al., Applicants believe that claim 1 of the present application is patentably distinct over the claims of GALLANT et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims, namely claims 2-13, under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claim 14 recites, among other features, "a policy server associated with said signaling intercept processor, said policy server including at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, wherein said policy server operates to effectuate a particular policy feature with respect to said call when triggered by said signaling message received from said signaling intercept processor." Identical features to these features of claim 14, or even similar features, are not recited in any of claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. Since claim 14 recites features not contained in claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al., Applicants believe that claim 14 of the present application is patentably distinct over the claims of GALLANT et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14, and its dependent claims, namely claims 15-38, under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claim 39 recites, among other features, "upon receiving in said ATM network node a signaling message with respect to a call from a party, propagating said signaling message to a policy server operably associated with said ATM network node;" and "upon determining that a policy condition associated with a particular policy feature to be invoked is satisfied with respect to said signaling message, effectuating a treatment for said call based on said particular policy feature." Identical features to these features of claim 39, or even similar features, are not recited

in any of claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. Since claim 39 recites features not contained in claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al., Applicants believe that claim 39 of the present application is patentably distinct over the claims of GALLANT et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 39, and its dependent claims, namely claims 40-65, under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting is, therefore, respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-65 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-22 of GALLANT et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands objected due to an informality. In particular, the Examiner questions whether "a policy server" in line 10 of claim 1 is the same server as "an intelligent policy server" in line 1 of claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that line 1 of claim 1 does not recite an intelligent policy server. Instead, line 1 of claim 1 specifically recites "[a]n intelligent policy server method" (emphasis added). A "policy server" is first recited in line 10 of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-16, 18, 31, 38-43, 45, 58, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claims 1-3, 5, 10-16, 18, 31, 38-43, 45, 58, and 65.

For example, independent claim 1 is directed to an intelligent policy server method in an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) network having an ingress switch and an egress switch, wherein said ingress switch serves an ingress device operated by a calling party and said egress switch serves an egress device operated by a called party. The method includes receiving, in said ingress switch, a signaling message from said ingress device; providing said signaling message to a signaling intercept processor associated with said ingress switch; propagating said signaling message to a policy server, said policy server including at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features; determining in said policy server, based at least in part on said signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked; if so, determining whether a policy condition associated with said particular policy feature is satisfied with respect to said signaling message; and establishing a connection path between said ingress switch and said egress switch based on said determination that said policy condition is satisfied by said signaling message. BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features. The Examiner relies on BUYUKKOC et al.'s routing status database (RSD) server 730 as corresponding to the recited policy server and on col. 14, line 9, to col. 15, line 50, col. 10, lines 10-20, col. 11, lines 1-6, and col. 13, lines 1-6 and 29-67, of BUYUKKOC et al. as allegedly disclosing propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features (Office Action, pp. 6-7). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of BUYUKKOC et al.

At col. 14, line 9, to col. 15, line 50, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses that the RSD server contains some or all of the following information for each (source, destination) pair: connectivity information regarding the set of routes that can be used to interconnect the source and destination; information about alternate routes; information on the capacity of each route in the network; status of all of the routes in the network; and the data needed to manage routing features responsible for distributing load to multiple physical destinations based on some rule or logic. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. also discloses sample α-link status, β-link status, and route status tables. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1.

At col. 10, lines 10-20, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses:

> The small size of the tables in each edge node that maintains information about the traffic contributed to the network by that edge node makes frequent updates and fast routing decisions easier to implement. The computation and control functionality that has been described above can be placed either in the edge node or in a closely linked adjunct. The CFNI functionality can reside in a specially designated edge node, a network database such as a signal control point (SCP), or a stand-alone network element. The CFNI can be replicated for reliability, and it can also be implemented in a distributed manner.

This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses where specific routing tables and functionality can reside in a network. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1. In fact, this section of BUYUKKOC et al. does not mention the RSD server, which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the recited policy server.

At col. 11, lines 1-16, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses:

> the RSD on a per-call basis, and using default routes for a particular destination, where the default route may be changed from time to time by the RSD to reflect changing network conditions.
>
> The RSD may be used in conjunction with a number of other innovations. For example, the RSD may be used in conjunction with a service control point (SCP) of an Intelligent network. An SCP determines an appropriate destination for a call having more than one possible destination, such as a call to the 800 number of a large customer that may be routed to one of a number of regional service centers.

This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses determining a destination for a call. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way relates to propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1.

At col. 13, lines 1-6, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses:

> when a new call is originated, and provides CRSDS 630 with the origin and destination of the call. CRSDS 630 decides how to route the call, based on the status of the pre-determined routes, preferably selecting the least congested of the predetermined routes for the origin destination pair, and communicates this decision to the querying edge.

This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses determining how to route a call based on the status of pre-determined routes. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way relates to propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe status signals as at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features.

At col. 13, lines 29-67, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses:

> Optionally, each backbone ATM switch 710 is connected to an RRSDS by a link 760. Each RRSDS is connected to a CRSDS 730 by a link 770.
>
> The architecture of FIG. 7 may be used in ways similar to that of FIG. 6.

> However, edge nodes 720 and optionally backbone ATM nodes 710 track information regarding bandwidth usage, and transmit this information to RRSDSs 740. RRSDSs forward the information to CRSDS 730, preferably aggregating the information before forwarding. For example, a particular RRSDS 740 may receive information from several edge nodes 720 regarding the amount of bandwidth that each of the edge nodes uses on a particular β-link 715. RRSDS 740 may aggregate this information into a single piece of information that represents the total bandwidth used on the particular β-link by those edge nodes 720 that are connected to the particular RRSDS 740. CRSDS 730 receives information from each RRSDS 740, and uses this information to compute the total bandwidth usage on each α-link and each β-link.
>
> In a fourth of the second group of embodiments usage information is then preferably distributed to the RRSDSs 740, where it is used to compute route congestion status. Preferably, each RRSDS 740 only computes route congestion status for those routes that originate at edge nodes 720 that are connected to the particular RRSDS 740. Edge nodes query the RRSDS to which they are connected to establish how a call should be routed. The fourth of the second group of embodiments is similar to the second of the second group of embodiments. However, there are several RRSDSs 740 that respond to queries from edge nodes 720, instead of a single CRSDS. The fourth embodiment advantageously distributes the burden of responding to such queries, reducing the burden on CRSDS 730, and also reducing bandwidth usage in the network used to carry the queries by reducing the average distance that a query must travel.
>
> The architecture of FIG. 7 may also be used in other ways, similar to those described for the architecture of FIG. 6. For example, the calculation of route congestion status may occur at CRSDS 730, RRSDSs 740, or edge nodes 720.

This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses that usage information may be used for computing route congestion status. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way relates to propagating a signaling message to a policy server, where the policy server includes at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe route congestion status signals as at least one policy profile having a plurality of policy features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically explain what portion of the information stored in the RSD server can reasonably be

construed as corresponding to a policy profile and what portion or portions could reasonably be construed as a plurality of policy features, as required by claim 1.

BUYUKKOC et al. does not further disclose or suggest determining, in the policy server, based at least in part on the signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, as also recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies on step 840 in Fig. 8, steps 1035 and 1040 in Fig. 10, col. 13, lines 1-7, col. 13, line 64, to col. 14, line 67, and Tables VII-IX of BUYUKKOC et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of BUYUKKOC et al.

Step 840 in BUYUKKOC et al.'s Fig. 8 discloses that the RSD selects a route for a new call. This step of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe selecting a route as corresponding to determining if a policy feature is to be invoked.

Step 1035 in BUYUKKOC et al.'s Fig. 10 discloses that the RSD selects a virtual channel identifier (VCI) within a virtual path identifier (VPI). This step of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe selecting a VCI as corresponding to determining if a policy feature is to be invoked.

Step 1040 in BUYUKKOC et al.'s Fig. 10 discloses the mapping of a first VPI/VCI pair to a second VPI/VCI. This step of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a

particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe mapping a first VPI/VCI pair to second VPI/VCI pair as corresponding to determining if a policy feature is to be invoked.

At col. 13, lines 1-7, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses:

> when a new call is originated, and provides CRSDS 630 with the origin and destination of the call. CRSDS 630 decides how to route the call, based on the status of the pre-determined routes, preferably selecting the least congested of the predetermined routes for the origin destination pair, and communicates this decision to the querying edge node 620, which then routes the call.

This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses determining how to route a call based on the status of pre-determined routes. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way relates to determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe selecting a route as corresponding to determining if a policy feature is to be invoked.

At col. 13, line 64, to col. 14, line 67, BUYUKKOC et al. discloses that the RSD server contains some or all of the following information for each (source, destination) pair: connectivity information regarding the set of routes that can be used to interconnect the source and destination; information about alternate routes; information on the capacity of each route in the network; status of all of the routes in the network; and the data needed to manage routing features responsible for distributing load to multiple physical destinations based on some rule or logic. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. also discloses the contents of an α-link status table and a β-link status table. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a

particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. In fact, this section of BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest invoking any type of feature.

Tables VII-IX in BUYUKKOC et al. correspond to an α-link status table, a β-link status table, and a route status table, respectively. These tables of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way disclose or suggest determining, in a policy server, based at least in part on a received signaling message, if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, as required by claim 1. Instead, these tables merely contain status information for α-links, β-links, and routes. One skilled in the art would not reasonably construe status information as invoking a policy feature.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 10-13 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by BUYUKKOC et al.

For example, claim 10 recites that the particular policy feature comprises a maximum burst size limit feature. The Examiner relies on col. 14, lines 15-65, of BUYUKKOC et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 9). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of BUYUKKOC et al.

Col. 14, lines 15-65, of BUYUKKOC et al. is reproduced above. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses that the RSD server contains some or all of the following information for each (source, destination) pair: connectivity information regarding the set of routes that can be used to interconnect the source and destination; information about alternate

routes; information on the capacity of each route in the network; status of all of the routes in the network; and the data needed to manage routing features responsible for distributing load to multiple physical destinations based on some rule or logic. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. also discloses that an α-link status table includes a link identifier, information identifying a current usage of the link, congestion thresholds for the link, and a status of the link. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, where the particular policy feature comprises a maximum burst size limit feature, as required by claim 10. In fact, this section of BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest invoking any type of feature.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants requests that the Examiner specifically explain how the above section of BUYUKKOC et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing determining if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, where the particular policy feature comprises a maximum burst size limit feature, as required by claim 10.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 10 is not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al.

Claim 13 recites that the particular policy feature comprises a maximum concurrent call limit feature. The Examiner relies on col. 14, lines 15-65, of BUYUKKOC et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 9). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of BUYUKKOC et al.

Col. 14, lines 15-65, of BUYUKKOC et al. is reproduced above. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. discloses that the RSD server contains some or all of the following information for each (source, destination) pair: connectivity information regarding the set of

routes that can be used to interconnect the source and destination; information about alternate routes; information on the capacity of each route in the network; status of all of the routes in the network; and the data needed to manage routing features responsible for distributing load to multiple physical destinations based on some rule or logic. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. also discloses that an α-link status table includes a link identifier, information identifying a current usage of the link, congestion thresholds for the link, and a status of the link. This section of BUYUKKOC et al. in no way discloses or suggests determining if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, where the particular policy feature comprises a maximum concurrent call limit feature, as required by claim 13. In fact, this section of BUYUKKOC et al. does not disclose or suggest invoking any type of feature.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants requests that the Examiner specifically explain how the above section of BUYUKKOC et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing determining if a particular policy feature is to be invoked, where the particular policy feature comprises a maximum concurrent call limit feature, as required by claim 13.

Independent claims 14 and 39 recite features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features described above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 14 and 39 are not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 15, 16, 31, and 38 depend from claim 14. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by BUYUKKOC et al.

For example, claim 38 recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features recited above with respect to claim 13. Therefore, this claim is not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 13.

Claims 40-43, 45, 58, and 65 depend from claim 39. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by BUYUKKOC et al.

For example, claim 65 recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features recited above with respect to claim 13. Therefore, this claim is not anticipated by BUYUKKOC et al. for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 13.

Claims 4, 17, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of NOAKE et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. The disclosure of NOAKE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and NOAKE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 17 depends from claim 14. The disclosure of NOAKE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and NOAKE et al., whether taken

alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 44 depends from claim 39. The disclosure of NOAKE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 39. Therefore, claim 44 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and NOAKE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 19-21, 23, 25, 46-48, 50, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of CHRISTIE et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 6, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1. The disclosure of CHRISTIE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 6, 8, and 9 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and CHRISTIE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 19-21, 23, and 25 depend from claim 14. The disclosure of CHRISTIE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claims 19-21, 23, and 25 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and CHRISTIE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claims 46-48, 50, and 52 depend from claim 39. The disclosure of CHRISTIE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect

to claim 39. Therefore, claims 46-48, 50, and 52 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and CHRISTIE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

Claims 7, 22, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of FARRIS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. The disclosure of FARRIS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and FARRIS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 22 depends from claim 14. The disclosure of FARRIS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claim 22 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and FARRIS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 49 depends from claim 39. The disclosure of FARRIS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 39. Therefore, claim 49 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and FARRIS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

Claims 27-29 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of KOBAYASHI et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 27-29 depend from claim 14. The disclosure of KOBAYASHI et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claims 27-29 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and KOBAYASHI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claims 54-56 depend from claim 39. The disclosure of KOBAYASHI et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 39. Therefore, claims 54-56 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and KOBAYASHI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

Claims 30 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of SMITH et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 30 depends from claim 14. The disclosure of SMITH et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claim 30 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and SMITH et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 57 depends from claim 39. The disclosure of SMITH et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 39.

Therefore, claim 57 is patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and SMITH et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

Claims 32-37 and 59-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over BUYUKKOC et al. in view of KALKKI et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 32-37 depend indirectly from claim 14. The disclosure of KALKKI et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claims 32-37 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and KALKKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claims 59-64 depend from claim 39. The disclosure of KALKKI et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of BUYUKKOC et al. set forth above with respect to claim 39. Therefore, claims 59-64 are patentable over BUYUKKOC et al. and KALKKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: _____
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: February 27, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Attachment: Replacement Abstract

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

An intelligent policy server ~~system and method for providing~~ provides multiple service features and ~~for controlling~~ controls bandwidth usage in an ATM network. Signaling messages generated at ~~the user-network interface (i.e.,~~ an edge switch[[)]] prior to establishing an end-to-end switched virtual circuit are intercepted by a signaling intercept processor for effectuating policy features or permissions by executing appropriate service logic at the policy server associated with the edge switch. A return message from the policy server determines whether a call connection can be made through the network ~~or not~~. Profile arrays are provided which define feature authorizations and provisioning for subscribers and Customer Logical Ports served by the edge switches. Depending on the triggers associated with a signaling message received in the edge switch, a particular feature is invoked and executed by the policy server, such as source address validation, address screening, burst-size limit, class-of-service provisioning, maximum concurrent call connections in progress, bandwidth control, and call frequency rate limit. ~~Source address validation, address screening, burst-size limit, class-of-service provisioning, maximum concurrent call connections in progress, bandwidth control, and call frequency rate limit are provided as exemplary features implemented in a presently preferred exemplary embodiment of the present invention.~~